DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 128 HE 022 157

AUTHOR Washton, Nathan S.
TITLE Developing a Faculty Checklist for Self-Evaluation for Teaching-Learning Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 13 Oct 88
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (Keystone, CO, October 13, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Check Lists; College Faculty; *College Instruction; Educational Planning; Evaluation; *Faculty Development; Guidelines; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Evaluation Check List

ABSTRACT

The development of a faculty self-evaluation checklist is described. The development of this checklist caused many faculty members to ask about what students look for in good teaching. Most faculty members report that using the checklist causes many changes in their teaching. The checklist was developed in three major categories: (1) planning instruction, (2) techniques of instruction, and (3) evaluation of instruction. Planning instruction covers whether the teacher prepared an outline for class instruction, checked with multi-media personnel to determine which audio-visual aids were available for lectures, and knew the students' general background of subject matter. Techniques of instruction covers whether the teacher looked over plans and materials for instruction, used a chalkboard or handouts, maintained professional student conduct at all times, and asked thought provoking questions. Evaluation instruction asks if the instructor observed the faces of the students for boredom or lack of understanding, evaluated student understanding of the lecture, presented questions at strategic times, and provided reliable, valid written tests. Educational research suggests that more learning occurs when students are actively involved, and when teachers set high, attainable goals, academic performance generally rises to meet those expectations. Contains 15 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303128

DEVELOPING A FACULTY CHECKLIST FOR SELF-EVALUATION FOR TEACHING-LEARNING EFFECTIVENESS[1]

Nathan S. Washton*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nathan Washton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Even after a stimulating lecture, a professor may wonder how much did the students really learn. Were all the concepts, facts, and illustrations included? What was the basis for the lack of student questions or too many questions? Were some students disinterested? These are common concerns that college faculty may experience at various times.

As a result of observing several hundred professors teach at a number of colleges, the writer in conjunction with the faculties formulated a faculty self-evaluation checklist. After each classroom visit, a confidential conference was held with each faculty member and the writer. The major discussion in each conference dealt with what were the strengths and possible problem areas that the instructor sensed during the teaching period. The instructor was asked, "what changes if any, would you make to alleviate or minimize the problems?" Also, educational research was introduced.

Studies pertaining to curriculum, teaching strategies, objectives, motivation, evaluation, grades, student interest and attitudes, mentoring, and classroom management were briefly identified where needed. A cursory examination of other faculty members comments about the developing checklist was also

---

1 Presented at the annual meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education at Keystone, Colorado on October 13, 1988

* Professor emeritus Queens College of the City University of New York

HE 022 157

made during the conference. No report was provided for the administration since each conference was confidential. The purpose of this study was to provide a resource person in helping faculty promote student learning as well as to develop the self-evaluation checklist with and for the faculty.

In using the checklist, the following six guiding principles were useful to the faculty:

1. Use those suggestions with which the faculty are comfortable.
2. Not all of the recommendations are suitable for all courses or for all instructors.
3. Compare the results of your checklist with your peers for similarities and differences.
4. Do not give up a new procedure or technique of instruction after one attempt; in a different classroom situation or for a different topic, the same technique may prove to be successful.
5. Faculty agree that there is no one perfect lesson since the learning process varies with each student.
6. Faculty report that the continued use of the checklist is very helpful towards teaching effectiveness and classroom learning.

Keeping these guiding criteria in the forefront, the Faculty Self-Evaluation Checklist was developed into three major categories: Planning Instruction, Techniques of Instruction and Evaluation of Instruction.

PLANNING INSTRUCTION

1. Did I prepare an outline (written or mental) for class instruction which
   a. lists the major objective(s) in the form of an important concept, principle, skill(s), attitude(s) to be developed?
   b. lists the specific instructional methods or procedures such as lecture, analogy, demonstration, laboratory, case study, use of audio-visual aids (cassette, tape, slide, overhead projector, video screen, film, chart, model,etc.
   c. contains an outline of what will appear on chalkboard emphasizing correct spelling of new vocabulary, definitions, major concept, drawing(s) or sketches.
   d. indicates an appropriate problem, if applicable or a vital question that is relevant to the discussion of the topic.
   e. suggests formative evaluation in the form of questions, discussions and observations.
2. Did I check with multi media personnel to determine which audio-visual aids are available for my lectures, discussions, demonstrations for the next few weeks?
3. Do I have a recent research study or significant paper on the topic of the day that I could bring to the attention of my students?
4. Do I know my students general background of subject matter to help me plan the appropriate selection of content and material for instruction?

5. Have I examined the reading assignments and appropriate suggestions for student learning?

TECHNIQUES OF INSTRUCTION

1. Did I look over my plans and materials for instruction?
2. Am I using the chalkboard, hand outs or transparencies in accordance with my plan of instruction?
   a. correct spelling of new vocabulary
   b. headings or titles when listing items on the board
   c. legible, written material in suitable size to be viewed throughout the classroom
   d. drawings or skecthes that are clear and visible with good size labels
3. Am I maintaining professional student conduct at all times and also have a sense of humor?
4. Am I presenting the lecture or explanation in a clear, logical and analytical manner?
5. Do I ask if there are any questions and do I answer them in a manner which promotes student understanding? If class time does not permit answers to certain questions at the moment, what provisions do I make? After class, next class meeting, office, reading, etc.
6. Do I want students to take notes and does my rate of speech permit students to write notes efficiently without boring them?
7. Can the person talking (professor or student) be
   a. heard at all times by <u>all</u> students? microphone?

b. Am I or the student talking in a low voice to only one student in answering a question and as a result I lose the attention of the whole class?

c. Do I ask the students to speak louder each time or are the questions and answers repeated each time?

8. Do I ask a number of thought provoking questions in addition to simple, factual ones?

9. Is the visual aid or demonstration visible to all students throughout the classroom?

   a. is a platform needed for better observation?

   b. should all students come forward?

10. Whenever possible, is instruction relevant to related topics or subjects?

EVALUATING INSTRUCTION

1. Am I observing the faces of my students to detect if they exhibit a lack of understanding or if they are bored?

2. Is my level of instruction appropriate to the minimum requirements and stimulating enough to carry the students with more advanced background?

3. Am I evaluating student understanding of the lecture, laboratory, or demonstration by the kind of questions and answers they give in class?

4. Do I present questions at strategic times to sample student learning?

5. Do I observe psychomotor skills performed by the students?

6. Are the written tests valid and reliable?

   a. Is there a balance of class material and reading assignments?

   b. Am I requiring the students to maintain a professional decorum during examinations?

   c. Is the level of difficulty of the questions in line with what is bing taught?

   d. Do I assess the total work of the student in giving a final grade?

   e. Are the course objectives reflected both in class activity as well as on the examinations?

   f. Are students given the opportunity to discuss the results of the examination with the instructor?

WHAT DOES EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SUGGEST

K. Patricia Cross distilled the findings from educational research to promote student learning into three major conclusions:

1. More learning occurs when students are actively involved. Experiments pertaining to problem solving, transfer of information, retention, thinking, motivation and changes in attitudes show that discussions are more effective than lectures in developing these objectives. Cross (1987) states: "An excellent lecturemay get excellent involvement, while a poor one may get none." Involvement alone isn't enough.

2. The second conclusion is that practice is essential for learning. If discussion or questions on tests demand little more than mere memorization then sloppy thinking in discussion may become the result. The outcome for example, may be planned for critical thinking. Unless the students are given opportunities to practice critical thinking, the outcome may be counterproductive or non-productive in the learning process.

3. "If teachers set high but attainable goals, academic performance usually rises to meet expectations,"writes Cross. Much evidence is available for for this "Pygmalion"effect as noted by Richardson (1983). This study reported unspoken agreement between student and professor where no heavy demands were made by both groups. As a result both professor and student did not work much to promote learning.

Educational research finds the importance of student participation before, during and after lectures.(See Osterman (1982), Noll and Allen (1982), and Lysakowski and Walberg (1982). Since 1974, the Feedback Lecture has been in use at Oregon State University. When students were given pre-tests, study guides, a page on objectives, advanced terminology, and an introductory theme before coming to lecture, they performed very well. A change in student attitudes and better learning was reported when students were more active during the learning process.

Professors have learned the importance of encouraging students to ask questions. During individual conferences with the faculty after a classroom observation, the writer would relate the educational research findings when appropriate. Thus, in addition to the strategic use of questions, the writer discussed mentoring and how graduate students related to their mentors.

The development of the self-evaluation checklist caused many faculty to inquire what do students look for in good teaching. Students favor professors who are well prepared in their subject, enthusiastic, clear in their explanations, available in and out of class, interested in the students as people, and who prepare examinations that are fair. The majority of the faculty report that faculty development workshops initiated the development of the self-evaluation checklist and that using the checklist caused many changes in their teaching.

REFERENCES

Arons, A.B. Cultivating the Capacity for Formal Reasoning: Objectives and Procedures in an Introductory Physical Science Course." American Journal of Physics, September 1976, 44 (9), 834-838.

Bloom, Benjamin S. "The New Direction in Educational Research: Alterable Variables." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1980, 61 (6), 382-385.

Cross, K.Patricia Teaching for Learning. Bulletin of the Association for Higher Education. April 1987, 39 (8),3-7.

Braskamp, L.A.,D.Caulley and F. Costin. "Student Ratings: Instructor Self-ratings and Their Relationship to Student Achievement." American Educational Research Journal Summer 1979, 16 (3),295-306.

Centra, John A. "Student Ratings of Instruction and Their Relationship to Student Learning." American Educational Research Journal, Winter 1977, 14 (1) 17-24.

Dillon, J.T. "Cognitive Correspondence Between Question/Statement Response." American Educational Research Journal, Winter 1982, 19 (4), 540-551.

Larkin, Jill et al. "Expert and Novice Performance in Solving Physics Problems." Science, 208, 1335-1342.

Levinson-Rose J. and Menges, R.J. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research" Review of Educational Research, Winter 1981, 51 (3), 403=454/

Lysakowski, Richard S. and Walberg, Herbert J. "Instructional Effects of Cues, Participation, and Corrective Feedback: A Quantitative Synthesis." American Educational Research Journal Winter 1982, 19 (4), 559-578.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. and Associates. Teaching and Learning in the College Classroom: A Review of the Research Literature. National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,1986.

Marsh, H.W. and Overall, J.U. "Validity of Students' Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness: Cognitive and Affective Criteria" Journal of Educational Psychology. 1980, 72, 468-475.

Noll, Michael B. and Allen, Robert D. "Developing Critical Thinking Skills in Biology" Journal of College Science Teaching. November 1982, 12 (2), 95-98.

Osterman, Dean H. "Classroom Lecture Management: Increasing Individual Involvement and Learning in the Lecture Style." September 1982, 12 (1), 22-23.

Seldin, Peter. "Faculty Surveying Policy and Practices." Change, April 1984, 29-33.

Wilson, Robert C. "Improving Faculty Teaching: Effective Use of Student Evaluations and Consultants." Journal of Higher Education, March/April 1986, 57 (2), 196-211.

. . . .